



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/686,526

10/16/2003

Shigeru Kurosawa

FQ5-616 KAT.045

3993

21254

7590

06/23/2008

MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

ROSARIO, DENNIS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/23/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to After Final Amendment***

1. The after final amendment was received on 6/3/08. Claims 1-20 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 6/3/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

102 rejection:

Applicants state that Saruwatari has no predetermined reference frame.

The examiner respectfully disagrees since Saruwatari teaches designing an apparatus with a small area set aside for character recognition as discussed in col. 2, lines 21-24. Thus, the fact that an apparatus is designed with the small area that serves as a reference for recognition even before operation of the apparatus as intended after a design cycle is a predetermined reference frame.

Applicant's state that Saruwatari does not teach a predetermined reference frame predetermined to be optimal in size for character recognition.

The examiner respectfully disagrees since Saruwatari teaches designing an apparatus with a desired small area set aside for character recognition as discussed in col. 2, lines 21-24, based on a success rate (of the prior art that has a “difficult[y] to improve the accuracy of recognition” in col. 2, lines 9-15) if the character is positioned within the reference frame (to improve the accuracy of the prior art) . Thus, the fact that an apparatus is designed with the desired small area that serves as a reference for recognition even before operation of the apparatus as intended after a design cycle is a predetermined reference frame predetermined to be optimal according to the designer that desires a small size for character recognition all of which is based on the shortcomings of the prior art to improve the recognition accuracy.

Applicant's state that Saruwatari does not teach claim 1, lines 4-7.

The examiner respectfully disagrees since Saruwatari discloses a display (fig. 1, num. 17) that includes a view finder display (corresponding to fig. 1, num., 20) that displays said real-time sensed images (since that is what a view finder is) and that includes a reference frame (said designed small area) that indicates a predetermined optimal size of characters (according to designers of the apparatus of fig. 1) to achieve a predetermined success rate (better than the prior art) for character recognition for a character positioned with the reference frame.

103 rejection:

Applicants state that Kubo does not teach a predetermined time delay after operation of the shutter key.

The examiner respectfully disagrees since Kubo teaches a predetermined time delay corresponding to fig. 7:  $T_d$  and  $T_d'$  and provides a solution of the time delay that was already determined in order to obtain a desired larger image.

Applicants state that the rationale provided by the examiner is inadequate.

The examiner respectfully disagrees since Kubo can compensate for fast moving objects that would be encountered in Saruwatari's natural pictures on a desired larger scale as opposed to Saruwatari's single ccd as discussed in Kubo col. 1, lines 32-40 by providing two ccd arrays in Kubo's teachings. Thus, the examiner's rationale is adequate.

Applicants state that Horii that provides a mobile phone is non-analogous to Saruwatari that provides a camera.

The examiner respectfully disagrees since Horii provides a mobile phone with camera; thus, Horii has common subject matter with Saruwatari.

Applicants state that there would be no reason to modify Saruwatari with Horii.

The examiner respectfully disagrees since Horii provides a communications use such as Internet, e-mail, phone number, mail text of the results of character recognition for both Saruwatari and Horii. Thus, Horri provides uses for the results of ocr that can be used to modify Saruwatari's results of ocr.